arXiv:1410.7889v2 [quant-ph] 27 Mar 2015

On generalized entropies and information-theoretic Bell inequalities under decoherence

Alexey E. Rastegin*
Department of Theoretical Physics, Irkutsk State University, Gagarin Bv. 20, Irkutsk 664003, Russia

We consider information-theoretic inequalities of the Bell type in the presence of decoherence. It is natural that too strong coupling with the environment can prevent an observation of quantum correlations. In this regard, the use of various entropic functions may give additional capabilities to reveal desired correlations. It was already shown that the Bell and Leggett–Garg inequalities in terms conditional Tsallis entropies are more sensitive in the cases of detection inefficiencies. In this paper, we study capabilities of generalized conditional entropies of the Tsallis type in analyzing the Bell theorem in decoherence scenarios. Two forms of the conditional Tsallis q-entropy are known in the literature. We show that each of them can be used for defining a metric in the probability space of interest. Such metrics can be used in realizing the so-called triangle principle. The triangle principle has recently been proposed as a unifying approach to questions of local realism and non-contextuality. Applying the triangle principle leads to the two families of q-metric inequalities of the Bell type. Information-theoretic formulations in terms of the q-entropic metrics are first discussed for the CHSH scenario in dephasing environment. Then we also revisit q-entropic inequalities of the Leggett–Garg type. An environmental influence is modeled by the phase damping channel and by the depolarizing channel.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Ud
Keywords: Bell theorem, Leggett–Garg inequality, conditional q-entropy, information distance, decoherence, quantum channel

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-classical nature of quantum correlations was independently emphasized in the Schrödinger "cat paradox" paper [1] and in the Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paper [2]. This character is clearly manifested in some experiments such as Bohm's version of the EPR argument [3]. Correlations observed experimentally are related to statistical predictions and probability distributions [4]. As was shown in the seminal papers by Bell [5, 6] and by Kochen and Specker [7], quantum mechanics is not consistent with some assumptions based on a classical experience. Bell's ideas have allowed to recast the problem of hidden variables as an experimentally tested statement [8]. Leggett–Garg inequalities [9] form a direction inspired by the Bell theorem. Such relations are based on the two assumptions known as the macroscopic realism and the noninvasive measurability at the macroscopic level [10]. As was shown by Bell, predictions of quantum theory is not compatible with the assumption of local realism. Similarly, the Kochen–Specker theorem and the Leggett–Garg inequalities stated that quantum mechanics is incompatible with the assumptions of non-contextuality and macrorealism, respectively. Since Leggett–Garg inequalities probe correlations of a single system measured at different times, decoherence is one of crucial problems in practice. Violations of the Leggett–Garg inequalities under decoherence were experimentally studied in Refs. [11, 12].

Original Bell inequalities were written as a restriction on mean values [5]. The Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger approach has given a statement without inequalities [13]. Formulations of Bell inequalities in terms of mean values typically assumes a fixed number of observable outcomes. Entropic treatment allows a unified expression irrespectively to a number of outcomes [14]. To test the local realism experimentally, several scenarios are known. The Clauser–Horne–Shimony–Holt (CHSH) scenario [15] is probably the most known setup. Entropic versions of Bell's theorem were considered in Refs. [16, 17]. These papers were mainly focused on the CHSH scenario. The Klyachko–Can–Binicioğlu–Shumovsky (KCBS) scenario [18] is currently the subject of active research. The CHSH and KCBS scenarios are respectively the $n = 4$ and $n = 5$ cases of the n-cycle scenario [19, 20]. For the n-cycle, the quantum violations occur for all n, though technical questions make their observation harder for $n \gg 1$ [21]. Information-theoretic Bell inequalities for the KCBS scenario were examined in Refs. [14, 22]. For both the CHSH and KCBS scenarios, inequalities in terms of Tsallis q-entropies were studied in Ref. [23]. The Leggett–Garg case deals with a cycle of observables taken at different times. In Ref. [24], the triangle principle has been proposed as a new approach to the

*Electronic address: rast@api.isu.ru; alexrastegin@mail.ru

non-locality and contextuality. Similar ideas were considered in Ref. [25]. Applications of this principle to qutrits with use of the Tsallis-type metrics were recently examined in Ref. [26].

In generalized Bell scenarios, we deal with the problem of deciding, whether observed data is compatible with a presumed causal relation between the variables [27]. It traditionally focuses on settings, when the region of compatible observations corresponds to some convex polytope. In principle, such polytopes can be represented by finitely many Bell inequalities. However, the size of characterization grows very fast as number and/or dimensionality of involved observables increases. For instance, a complete description of the n-cycle is given by an exponential number of tight inequalities [20]. Entropic inequalities are able to describe extended Bell scenarios that define complicated non-convex sets in the probabilistic space of interest [27–29]. Entropic inequalities of the Bell type are attractive due to their capabilities in studies of setting with arbitrary number of outcomes and inefficiencies of measurement devices. At the same time, entropic inequalities give only sufficient conditions of the non-locality or contextuality [14]. There are probability distributions that do violate Bell's inequality and do not its entropic counterpart. As was shown in Ref. [23], use of generalized entropies allows to extend a class of probability distributions, whose non-locality or contextuality can be expressed by an entropic approach. It is an alternative to the following approach. Adding a shared randomness [30], inequalities with the standard Shannon entropies can sometimes be turned into a necessary and sufficient condition. This has been shown for the n-cycle with dichotomic outcomes [30] in noise-free and error-free settings. For more outcomes or decoherence scenarios, inequalities with q-entropies are appropriate.

The aim of the present work is to study information-theoretic Bell inequalities based on generalized conditional entropies. Some advantages of this approach were already examined [23, 26, 31]. We will mainly focus on entropic inequalities of the Bell type under decoherence. This question seems to be not addressed in the literature. Indeed, variations of the parameter in q-entropic inequalities are useful in analyzing cases with detection inefficiencies [23, 31]. Formulation of restrictions of the Leggett–Garg type in terms of the Shannon entropies was examined in Ref. [32]. A q-entropic extension of this question has been discussed in Ref. [31]. We also aim to study information-theoretic Bell inequalities in the presence of decoherence. The contribution of the present paper is two-fold. First, we show that each of the two known forms of conditional q-entropy leads to the corresponding metric between random variables. One of the conditional q-entropies obeys the chain rule [33], whence the triangle inequality for a metric follows for $q \geq 1$. However, other conditional q-entropy does not share the chain rule. It is not obvious that a legitimate metric could be obtained in this way. Second, we consider violation of q-metric inequalities of the Bell type under decoherence. Decohering processes are one of crucial problems for an observation of quantum correlations in practice. In particular, dephasing processes can prefer a detection of such correlations.

In this paper, we will show that q-entropic inequalities could be useful in analysis of data of experiments in decohering environment. The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we consider those metrics that can be based on the conditional q-entropies. It is shown that the known conditional forms of the Tsallis entropy both lead to a legitimate metric for $q \geq 1$. Here, the triangle inequality is most important from the viewpoint of applications of the triangle principle. For one of the cases considered, the triangle inequality directly follows from the chain rule. In the second case, the desired result is obtained due to independent reasons. In Section III, inequalities of the Bell type are written as q-metric inequalities for the CHSH scenario with noise. Section IV is devoted to q-metric Leggett–Garg inequalities under decoherence. We demonstrate advantages of metric inequalities with some parameter that can be varied for maximizing a desired violation. Varying the parameter in q-entropic inequalities, a violation of the restrictions considered may become much more robust to decoherence. As models of quantum noise, the phase damping and depolarizing channels are utilized. In Section V, we conclude the paper with a summary of results.

II. CONDITIONAL TSALLIS ENTROPIES AND RELATED METRICS

In this section, we discuss required properties of the q-entropies and their conditional forms. Two kinds of the q-entropic metric will be examined. Let discrete random variable X take values on a finite set Ω_X of cardinality $\#\Omega_X$. The non-extensive entropy of degree $q > 0 \neq 1$ is defined by [34]

$$H_q(X) := \frac{1}{1-q}\left(\sum_{x\in\Omega_X} p(x)^q - 1\right). \tag{1}$$

With the factor $\left(2^{1-q}-1\right)^{-1}$ instead of $(1-q)^{-1}$, this function was examined by Havrda and Charvát [35] and later by Daróczy [36]. In statistical physics, the entropy (1) is extensively used due to Tsallis [34].

Obviously, the entropy (1) is concave for all $q > 0$. It is convenient to rewrite (1) as

$$H_q(X) = -\sum_{x\in\Omega_X} p(x)^q \ln_q p(x) = \sum_{x\in\Omega_X} p(x) \ln_q\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}\right). \tag{2}$$

Here, we used the q-logarithm defined for $q > 0 \neq 1$ and $\xi > 0$ as

$$\ln_q(\xi) = \frac{\xi^{1-q} - 1}{1-q} \ . \tag{3}$$

In the limit $q \to 1$, we obtain $\ln_q(\xi) \to \ln \xi$ and the standard Shannon entropy

$$H_1(X) = -\sum_{x \in \Omega_X} p(x) \, \ln p(x) \ . \tag{4}$$

For the uniform distribution, the maximal value $\ln_q(\#\Omega_X)$ of (1) is reached. The Rényi entropies [37] form another especially important family of one-parametric extensions of the Shannon entropy. The Rényi entropies are beyond the scope of the present work. Some properties and applications of such entropies are discussed in the book [38].

To define a metric, we will use conditional entropies. For brevity, we will omit symbols Ω_X and Ω_Y in entropic sums. The standard conditional entropy is defined by [39]

$$H_1(X|Y) := \sum\nolimits_y p(y) \, H_1(X|y) = -\sum\nolimits_x \sum\nolimits_y p(x,y) \, \ln p(x|y) \ . \tag{5}$$

Here, we use Bayes' rule $p(x|y) = p(x,y)/p(y)$ and the particular function

$$H_1(X|y) = -\sum\nolimits_x p(x|y) \, \ln p(x|y) \ . \tag{6}$$

In the literature, two kinds of the conditional q-entropy were discussed [33]. These forms are respectively inspired by the two expressions, which are shown in (2). The first form is defined as [33]

$$H_q(X|Y) := \sum\nolimits_y p(y)^q \, H_q(X|y) \ , \tag{7}$$

where

$$H_q(X|y) := \frac{1}{1-q} \left(\sum\nolimits_x p(x|y)^q - 1 \right) . \tag{8}$$

Similarly to (2), the equivalent expressions are written as

$$H_q(X|y) = -\sum\nolimits_x p(x|y)^q \, \ln_q p(x|y) \tag{9}$$

$$= \sum\nolimits_x p(x|y) \ln_q \left(\frac{1}{p(x|y)} \right) . \tag{10}$$

The conditional entropy (7) is, up to a factor, the quantity introduced by Daróczy [36]. For all $q > 0$, we have the chain rule [33, 36]

$$H_q(X,Y) = H_q(Y|X) + H_q(X) = H_q(X|Y) + H_q(Y) \ . \tag{11}$$

With $q = 1$, we have the chain rule with the standard conditional entropy (5). An immediate extension of (11) for more than two random variables was given in Ref. [33]. Relations of such kind play an important role in many information-theoretic derivations. For instance, the Braunstein–Caves derivation [16] of entropic Bell inequalities is based on the chain rule for the Shannon entropy.

As was noted in Ref. [14], information-theoretic Bell inequalities for the n-cycle scenario can be represented in terms of the mutual information. Similarly to the standard case, the mutual q-information can be defined as [33]

$$I_q(X;Y) := H_q(X) - H_q(X|Y) = H_q(Y) - H_q(Y|X) \ . \tag{12}$$

The equivalence of the two last expressions is provided by the chain rule (11). Formulation of the Bell theorem in terms of the mutual q-information has been addressed in Ref. [23].

Using the particular functional (8), the second form of conditional q-entropy is introduced as [33]

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X|Y) := \sum\nolimits_y p(y) \, H_q(X|y) \ . \tag{13}$$

Note that this form of conditional entropy does not share the chain rule of usual kind [33]. Hence, it is not directly related to the mutual q-information. Nevertheless, the entropy (13) has found to be useful at least as an auxiliary quantity [33, 40]. The conditional entropy (13) can also be used for measuring a distance between random variables.

The standard conditional entropy leads to the following metric [41]:

$$\Delta_1(X,Y) := H_1(X|Y) + H_1(Y|X) \ . \tag{14}$$

General properties of information distances are considered in Ref. [42]. The author of Ref. [33] discussed three forms of an entropic distance based on the Tsallis entropies. First of these distances is defined similarly to (14):

$$\Delta_q(X,Y) := H_q(X|Y) + H_q(Y|X) \ . \tag{15}$$

Due to (12), we can recast (15) as $\Delta_q(X,Y) = H_q(X,Y) - I_q(X;Y)$. As was shown in Ref. [33], the quantity (15) is a metric for $q \geq 1$. It satisfies the following properties.

(i) $\Delta_q(X,Y) \geq 0$ (non-negativity);

(ii) $\Delta_q(X,Y) = 0$ if and only if $X = Y$ (identity axiom);

(iii) $\Delta_q(X,Y) = \Delta_q(Y,X)$ (symmetry);

(iv) $\Delta_q(X,Z) \leq \Delta_q(X,Y) + \Delta_q(Y,Z)$ (triangle inequality).

The last property is easily derived from the inequality [33]

$$H_q(X|Z) \leq H_q(X|Y) + H_q(Y|Z) \ , \tag{16}$$

which holds for $q \geq 1$. Other q-entropic metrics are defined in terms of correlation coefficients [33]. One form of correlation coefficients is introduced as the ratio of the mutual q-information to the joint q-entropy. Then difference between 1 and this correlation coefficient leads to a metric for $q \geq 1$ [33]. It can also be interpreted as the result of division of (15) by the joint entropy $H_q(X,Y)$. Another correlation coefficient is defined as the ratio of the mutual q-information to the maximum of the entropies $H_q(X)$ and $H_q(Y)$. Hence, one leads to the third distance considered in Ref. [33]. It should be emphasized that the mentioned quantities are metrics only for $q \geq 1$. Further, validity of the triangle inequality for these distances is closely related to the chain rule. In Ref. [26], the mentioned q-entropic metrics were used to study Bell inequalities for a pair of entangled qutrits. These metrics can all be represented in terms of the mutual q-information together with either $H_q(X,Y)$ or $\max\{H_q(X), H_q(Y)\}$.

We shall now examine a q-entropic distance which cannot be expressed in terms of the mutual q-information. The conditional q-entropy (13) does not share the chain rule. Nevertheless, this conditional form leads to a legitimate metric as well. We shall analyze the question in more detail, since it seems to be not addressed in the literature. Similarly to (15), we can introduce another quantity

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X,Y) := \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y) + \widetilde{H}_q(Y|X) \ . \tag{17}$$

It is easy to check that the properties (i)–(iii) remain valid for (17). The only question concerns the triangle inequality. To resolve the question, we will examine some essential properties of the entropy (13).

Proposition 1 *For $q > 0$, the conditional entropy (13) satisfies*

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X,Y|Z) \geq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Z) \ . \tag{18}$$

Proof. Since the standard case $q = 1$ is well known, we further assume $q \neq 1$. Let positive numbers $a(y)$ satisfy $\sum_y a(y) = 1$. We then have

$$\sum\nolimits_y a(y)^q \geq 1 \qquad\qquad (0 < q < 1) \ , \tag{19}$$

$$\sum\nolimits_y a(y)^q \leq 1 \qquad\qquad (1 < q < \infty) \ . \tag{20}$$

Combining these relations with $\sum_y p(x,y|z) = p(x|z)$, we obtain

$$\sum_y \Big(p(x,y|z)^q - p(x,y|z) \Big) \geq p(x|z)^q - p(x|z) \qquad\qquad (0 < q < 1) \ , \tag{21}$$

$$\sum_y \Big(p(x,y|z)^q - p(x,y|z) \Big) \leq p(x|z)^q - p(x|z) \qquad\qquad (1 < q < \infty) \ . \tag{22}$$

Summarizing with respect to x and taking the sign of the factor $(1-q)^{-1}$, we have arrived at a conclusion. For all $q>0\neq 1$, one gives

$$H_q(X,Y|z)\geq H_q(X|z)\ . \tag{23}$$

Multiplying (23) by $p(z)$ and summing with respect to z, we finally obtain (18). ■

It is clear that the result (18) can be generalized as follows. For real $q>0$ and integer $n\geq 1$, we have

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X_1,\ldots,X_n,X_{n+1}|Z)\geq \widetilde{H}_q(X_1,\ldots,X_n|Z)\ . \tag{24}$$

We refrain from presenting details of the argumentation. The relations (18) and (24) will be used below in deriving the triangle inequality. As was already mentioned, the conditional entropy (13) does not share the chain rule [33]. Instead, we will use another statement.

Proposition 2 *The conditional entropy (13) satisfies the following inequalities:*

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X,Y|Z)-\widetilde{H}_q(Y|Z)\geq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y,Z) \qquad (0<q<1)\ , \tag{25}$$

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X,Y|Z)-\widetilde{H}_q(Y|Z)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y,Z) \qquad (1<q<\infty)\ . \tag{26}$$

Proof. Using $p(x,y|z)/p(y|z)=p(x|y,z)$ and the definition (8), we merely write

$$H_q(X,Y|z)-H_q(Y|z)=\frac{1}{1-q}\left(\sum\nolimits_{xy}p(x,y|z)^q-\sum\nolimits_{y}p(y|z)^q\right)$$

$$=\sum\nolimits_{y}p(y|z)^q\,\frac{1}{1-q}\,\left(\sum\nolimits_{x}p(x|y,z)^q-1\right)=\sum\nolimits_{y}p(y|z)^q\,H_q(X|y,z)\ . \tag{27}$$

As $p(y|z)\leq 1$, replacing $p(y|z)^q$ with $p(y|z)$ leads to

$$H_q(X,Y|z)-H_q(Y|z)\geq \sum\nolimits_{y}p(y|z)\,H_q(X|y,z) \qquad (0<q<1)\ , \tag{28}$$

$$H_q(X,Y|z)-H_q(Y|z)\leq \sum\nolimits_{y}p(y|z)\,H_q(X|y,z) \qquad (1<q<\infty)\ . \tag{29}$$

Further, we note $p(z)\,p(y|z)=p(y,z)$. Multiplying (28) and (29) by $p(z)$ and summing with respect to z, we complete the proof. ■

In principle, the formula (26) can be regarded as a weak version of the chain rule. Note that the standard conditional entropy (5) obeys the equality

$$H_1(X,Y|Z)-H_1(Y|Z)=H_1(X|Y,Z)\ . \tag{30}$$

We can obtain (30) by taking the limit $q\to 1$ in both the relations (25) and (26). We are now ready to prove that the conditional entropy (13) of degree $q\geq 1$ obeys the triangle inequality. This result is formulated as follows.

Proposition 3 *For $q\geq 1$, the conditional entropy (13) satisfies the triangle inequality*

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X|Z)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y)+\widetilde{H}_q(Y|Z)\ . \tag{31}$$

Proof. Using the properties (18) and (26), we obtain

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X|Z)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(X,Y|Z)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y,Z)+\widetilde{H}_q(Y|Z)\ . \tag{32}$$

The first inequality holds for all $q>0$, whereas the second one generally holds for $q\geq 1$. We further recall the fact that conditioning on more can only reduce the conditional entropy (13). Namely, for all $q>0$ we have [43]

$$\widetilde{H}_q(X|Y,Z)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(X|Y)\ . \tag{33}$$

Combining (32) with (33) completes the proof. ■

By permutations, we also write $\widetilde{H}_q(Z|X)\leq \widetilde{H}_q(Z|Y)+\widetilde{H}_q(Y|X)$. Adding the latter to (31), for $q\geq 1$ we obtain

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X,Z)\leq \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X,Y)+\widetilde{\Delta}_q(Y,Z)\ . \tag{34}$$

In other words, for $q\geq 1$ the entropic quantity (17) is a legitimate metric. Thus, both the quantities (15) and (17) can be adopted as information distances in realizing the triangle principle. In the next sections, we will consider this question with respect to the Bell theorem and the Leggett–Garg inequalities.

III. METRIC INEQUALITIES FOR THE CHSH SCENARIO IN DEPHASING ENVIRONMENT

In this section, we will study q-metric inequalities for the CHSH scenario with focusing on the role of decoherence. The CHSH scenario is a primary example of the so-called n-cycle scenarios [19, 20]. It is typically used in studies of conceptual questions of quantum theory [44, 45]. The notion of marginal scenarios provides a general way to treat related properties of probability distributions [14, 46]. The triangle principle provides another general approach to the problem [24].

We will formulate quantitative relations in terms of the q-metrics (15) and (17) for $q \geq 1$. Let us recall briefly details of the CHSH scenario. In this scenario, we deal with an entanglement of two spacelike separated subsystems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Let observables A and A' be used for one subsystem, and let observables B and B' be used for other. No one of the pairs $\{A, A'\}$ and $\{B, B'\}$ is jointly measurable. Each element of $\{A, A'\}$ is compatible with each element of $\{B, B'\}$, since these sets are related to different subsystems. Applying the triangle inequality, we simply obtain two relations

$$\Delta_q(A,B) \leq \Delta_q(A,B') + \Delta_q(B',A') + \Delta_q(A',B) \ , \tag{35}$$

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_q(A,B) \leq \widetilde{\Delta}_q(A,B') + \widetilde{\Delta}_q(B',A') + \widetilde{\Delta}_q(A',B) \ . \tag{36}$$

In the usual CHSH scenario, each of the observables has two possible outcomes rescaled as ± 1. This assumption leads to concrete form of the bound on mean values. However, entropic formulations of Bell's theorem have the same form irrespectively to the number of outcomes or the chosen scale for observables [14]. The authors of Ref. [16] derived Bell's inequality for the CHSH scenario in terms of the Shannon entropies. This inequality is often referred to as the Braunstein–Caves inequality.

Following Ref. [16], we consider a quantum spin-s system. To exemplify violations of the relations (35) and (36), one uses the following setup. Two counter-propagating spin-s particles are emitted by the decay of a system with zero angular momentum. In the simplest case $s = 1/2$, we use the operator $\mathsf{S}_z = (\hbar/2)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z$ with the eigenstates

$$|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{37}$$

The state of two particles with zero total momentum is written as

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Big(|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle - |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \Big) \ . \tag{38}$$

We now take the four unit vectors $\vec{a}$, $\vec{a}'$, $\vec{b}$, and $\vec{b}'$. In the quantum-mechanical description, the quantities A and A' are represented as the operators $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{\mathsf{S}}$ and $\vec{a}' \cdot \vec{\mathsf{S}}$. The quantities B and B' are given in the same way. Following Ref. [16], we consider four coplanar vectors such that

$$\measuredangle(\vec{a},\vec{b}') = \measuredangle(\vec{b}',\vec{a}') = \measuredangle(\vec{a}',\vec{b}) = \theta/3, \qquad \measuredangle(\vec{a},\vec{b}) = \theta \ . \tag{39}$$

Using of coplanar vectors is easy to realize and widely used. We will see that such a choice is illustrative for comparing different entropies in the noisy case. Due to the properties of the standard conditional entropy, Braunstein and Caves formulated an information-theoretic inequality of the Bell type [16]. In the considered situation, their result is equivalent to the case $q = 1$ of the formulas (35) and (36). The Braunstein–Caves inequality expresses the fact that there exists some joint probability distribution for the four random variables. In principle, the relation (35) can also be reached on this ground [23]. Here, the chain rule (11) is very important. Since the conditional entropy (13) does not share the chain rule, the relation (36) cannot be obtained in such a way.

It was found that the strength of violation of the Braunstein–Caves inequality increases as s increases [16]. On the other hand, the growth of s leads to decreasing of a range of values θ, for which violations occur. The situation under consideration was also examined within the q-entropic approach [23]. With the above choice of the vectors, the Bell type inequality of Ref. [23] is actually tantamount to (35). In this regard, the second inequality (36) is a novel result. The q-entropic approach allows to get some advances [23]. First, we can significantly expand a class of probability distributions, for which the non-locality is testable in this way. That is, some variations of $q \geq 1$ allow to wide a range of values θ, for which violations occur. Second, the q-entropic inequalities are expedient in analyzing cases with detection inefficiencies [23]. Two models of detection inefficiencies in combination with the Braunstein–Caves inequality were considered in Ref. [14].

Real experiments to test Bell inequalities are all non-ideal [47]. Violations of the Bell inequalities in the presence of decoherence and noise were studied in several papers [48–52]. However, information-theoretic formulations of the Bell theorem were not addressed therein. Experimental studies of contextual properties of polarization states of

biphotons under decoherence are reported in Ref. [53]. We shall now show that the q-entropic approach is very useful in analyzing data of experiments in decohering environment. Here, we will mainly focus on (36), since it was not considered previously. Suppose that each of two particles is subjected to dephasing noise during its propagation from the point of emission to the detector. The Kraus operators of the phase damping channel are written as [54]

$$\mathsf{E}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\lambda} \end{pmatrix} , \qquad \mathsf{E}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{40}$$

For brevity, we denote $\lambda(t) = 1 - \exp(-2\gamma t)$. During the time t, the density matrix of a single qubit is mapped as

$$\boldsymbol{\rho} \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathsf{E}_0 \, \boldsymbol{\rho} \, \mathsf{E}_0 + \mathsf{E}_1 \, \boldsymbol{\rho} \, \mathsf{E}_1 \ . \tag{41}$$

This channel describes one of fundamental quantum effects. In particular, it is helpful in understanding why a "live-dead" superposition of the Schrödinger cat becomes unlikely. It is also known that the phase damping channel can easily be converted to the phase flip one by a simple recombination [54].

If each of the two qubits is changed as (41), then the initial state (38) is transformed to

$$(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{E})\big(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|\big) = \sum_{j,k=0}^{1} (\mathsf{E}_j \otimes \mathsf{E}_k)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|(\mathsf{E}_j \otimes \mathsf{E}_k) \ . \tag{42}$$

By δt_1, we further mean the interval between the emission and the first local measurement on $\mathcal{A}$. The second local measurement on $\mathcal{B}$ will be performed δt_2 later. By calculations, we then obtain

$$(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_1)\big(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|\big) = \exp(-2\gamma\,\delta t_1)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| + \frac{\lambda(\delta t_1)}{2}\Big(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\Big) . \tag{43}$$

Here, the subscript "1" marks that this map is related to the first interval. Let us examine the case, when the plane of the vectors $\vec{a}$, $\vec{b}'$, $\vec{a}'$, $\vec{b}$ is orthogonal to the axis z. Dealing with probabilities, we can rescale the considered observables. Suppose that we first measure $\vec{a}\cdot\vec{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ on the qubit $\mathcal{A}$. With the pre-measurement state (43), the outcomes are equiprobable irrespectively to $\gamma\,\delta t_1$. When the outcome m has been obtained, the post-measurement state is

$$p(m)^{-1}(\Lambda_m(\vec{a}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_2)\left\{(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_1)\big(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|\big)\right\}(\Lambda_m(\vec{a}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_2) = \exp(-2\gamma\,\delta t_1)\,\Lambda_m(\vec{a}) \otimes \Lambda_{-m}(\vec{a}) + \lambda(\delta t_1)\,\Lambda_m(\vec{a}) \otimes \boldsymbol{\rho}_* \ . \tag{44}$$

By $\Lambda_m(\vec{a})$, we denote the orthogonal projector on the eigenstate of $\vec{a}\cdot\vec{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue m. By $\boldsymbol{\rho}_* = \mathbb{1}_2/2$, we mean the completely mixed state of a qubit. The post-first-measurement state is further mapped by the phase damping channel during the interval δt_2. Since the state (44) is separable, it is merely mapped to

$$\exp(-2\gamma\,\delta t_1)\,\mathcal{E}_2\big(\Lambda_m(\vec{a})\big) \otimes \mathcal{E}_2\big(\Lambda_{-m}(\vec{a})\big) + \lambda(\delta t_1)\,\mathcal{E}_2\big(\Lambda_m(\vec{a})\big) \otimes \boldsymbol{\rho}_* \ . \tag{45}$$

Here, the subscript "2" marks that this map is related to the second interval. We also used that the completely mixed state is a fixed point the phase damping channel. The pre-measurement state of the qubit $\mathcal{B}$ is obtained by the partial trace operation:

$$\exp(-2\gamma\,\delta t_1)\,\mathcal{E}_2\big(\Lambda_{-m}(\vec{a})\big) + \lambda(\delta t_1)\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_* = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1}_2 + \vec{v}\cdot\vec{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\right) . \tag{46}$$

That is, the pre-measurement density matrix is represented by its Bloch vector $\vec{v} = (v_x, v_y, v_z)$. In terms of the Bloch vector, one gets

$$\vec{v} = -m\exp(-2\gamma\,\delta t_1)\exp(-\gamma\,\delta t_2)\,\vec{a}\,. \tag{47}$$

The action of the map $\mathcal{E}_2$ shrinks horizontal components of the initial Bloch vector by the factor $\exp(-\gamma\,\delta t_2) = \sqrt{1-\lambda(\delta t_2)}$. Measuring the observable $\vec{b}\cdot\vec{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, the outcome m' occurs with the probability

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(1 + m'\vec{b}\cdot\vec{v}\right) = \frac{1 - m'm\exp(-\gamma\,\delta t)\cos\theta}{2} = p(B = m'|A = m) \ . \tag{48}$$

Here, we use (39) and denote $\delta t = 2\,\delta t_1 + \delta t_2$. Thus, we obtain the conditional probability $p(B = m'|A = m)$. It turns out that the final expression (48) is symmetric in the labels m and m'. For other pairs of jointly measurable observables of interest, conditional probabilities are obtained by replacing θ with $\theta/3$ in the formula (48).



FIG. 1: The dependence $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ in the CHSH scenario with noise for five values of q, namely $q = 1.0; 1.2; 1.5; 2.0; 2.5$. For each value of q, only positive values of $\mathcal{S}_q$ are shown.

We shall now show that the obtained probability distributions sometimes violate the locality conditions (35) and (36). To characterize a violation of the restriction (36), we introduce a characteristic quantity

$$\mathcal{C}_q := \widetilde{\Delta}_q(A, B) - \widetilde{\Delta}_q(A, B') - \widetilde{\Delta}_q(B', A') - \widetilde{\Delta}_q(A', B) \ . \tag{49}$$

Strictly positive values of (49) will reveal violations of the q-metric inequality (36) in the presence of decoherence. A possibility to detect such violations essentially depends on the entropic parameter q. Note also that a strength of violations depends on values of the parameter $\gamma\,\delta t$. This parameter characterizes the influence of an environment in the model considered. To study the question, we put the ratio

$$\kappa := \frac{\gamma\,\delta t}{\theta/3} \ . \tag{50}$$

This quantity linearly increases with γ as well as with δt. The characteristic quantity (49) is some function $\mathcal{C}_q(\theta, \kappa)$ of two variables. We would like to see a trade-off between κ and q. Let us define the quantity

$$\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa) := \sup_{\theta} \mathcal{C}_q(\theta, \kappa) \ . \tag{51}$$

Such an approach is meaningful, since in real experiments we want to maximize a possible violation to be tested. It is very useful that the range of positivity of (51) essentially depends on q. To be more precise, we introduce the bound

$$\kappa_s(q) = \sup\{\kappa : \ \kappa \geq 0, \ \mathcal{S}_q(\kappa) > 0\} \ . \tag{52}$$

The first fact is that the strength of violations essentially depends on the parameter $q \geq 1$. To consider a behavior of the range of violations, we focus on $\kappa_s(q)$. It turns out that $\kappa_s(q)$ increases with q. The dependence of $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ on κ is shown in Fig. 1. For the first time, both the strength and the range of positivity are increased with q. Indeed, the curves with $q > 1$ all lie over the curve for $q = 1$. For sufficiently large q, however, the strength of positivity becomes reducing. Nevertheless, the least point $\kappa_s(q)$ still slowly increases with growing q. These results maintain a conclusion that the inequalities in terms of Tsallis' entropies give a suitable tool in studying the noisy case.

The above scheme could be used in cases, when observations have more than two outcomes. Of course, calculations become more complicated as well. From the experimental viewpoint, the trichotomic case is also important. Indeed, the CHSH setup with trichotomic observables can be realized with a pair of biphotons [56]. A violation of the q-metric inequalities in the CHSH case with trichotomic outcomes is also more robust to decoherence by varying the parameter. We refrain from presenting the details here, since similar conclusions were found in Ref. [26]. Instead, we will address the noisy trichotomic case in the Leggett–Garg scenario. The authors of Ref. [26] modeled a noise by

adding a completely mixed term to the noise-free density matrix of qutrit pair. We used more detailed approach, in which the environmental influence is taken into account through the phase damping channel applied to each of the particles.

Thus, the q-entropic approach is essential in analyzing data of Bell-type experiments in dephasing environments. In some cases, formulation with generalized entropies may be compared with the following approach. Adding a shared randomness into the experiment, the Shannon-entropy inequalities sometimes give the full information to conclude if a given correlation is non-local or not [30]. By the depolarization protocol of Ref. [55], this result was shown for any n-cycle with dichotomic outcomes [30]. However, experimental setups with a shared randomness may be vulnerable to noise. A way to implement such setting in the Leggett–Garg scenario is not obvious. These questions could be a theme of separate research. Further, the n-cycle scenario with trichotomic and more outcomes is also of interest. The use of q-entropies extended not only a class of probability distributions, for which incompatibility with the local realism or the macrorealism is testable in entropic terms [23, 31]. Additionally, the q-entropic approach is further motivated by its advantages in studying experiments with detection inefficiencies and by its robustness in the noisy case.

IV. ON METRIC LEGGETT–GARG INEQUALITIES UNDER DECOHERENCE

In this section, we will deal with information-theoretic inequalities of the Leggett–Garg type. These inequalities are based on the following two concepts [10]. First, we assume that physical properties of a macroscopic object preexist irrespectively to the act of observation. Second, measurements are non-invasive in the sense that the measurement of an observable at any instant of time does not alert its subsequent evolution. Following the ideas of Ref. [32], we consider the two-level system with the self Hamiltonian

$$\mathsf{H} = -\omega \mathsf{S}_z = -\frac{\hbar\omega}{2}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z \ . \tag{53}$$

Its eigenstates are the ground state $|0\rangle$ with energy $-\hbar\omega/2$ and the excited state $|1\rangle$ with energy $+\hbar\omega/2$. These states are explicitly written as (37). In studies of restrictions of the Leggett–Garg type, the Heisenberg picture is more convenient. The operator of unitary evolution is

$$\mathsf{U}(t) = \exp(-\mathtt{i}\hbar^{-1} t\mathsf{H}) = \exp\bigl(+\mathtt{i}(\omega t/2)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z\bigr) \ . \tag{54}$$

For brevity, we refer to measured results of some spin component as ± 1. Let us study information-theoretic inequalities of the Leggett–Garg type for the x-component of the spin. Assuming a validity of the macrorealistic approach, we will deal with the quantity $S_x(t)$. Our description of $S_x(t)$ should be carried out in line with the macroscopic realism *per se* and the non-invasive measurability. Let τ, τ', τ'' be three instants of the time. Denoting $X = S_x(\tau)$, $X' = S_x(\tau')$, $X'' = S_x(\tau'')$, for $q \geq 1$ we write the conditions

$$\Delta_q(X, X'') \leq \Delta_q(X, X') + \Delta_q(X', X'') \ , \tag{55}$$

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X'') \leq \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X') + \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X', X'') \ . \tag{56}$$

These formulas give a formulation of the Leggett–Garg inequalities in terms of the metrics (15) and (17), respectively. The inequalities (55) and (56) are sometimes violated by probability distributions calculated in quantum-mechanical way. The initial state is chosen to be completely mixed [32]. In the basis $\bigl\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\bigr\}$, eigenstates of the operator $\mathsf{S}_x = (\hbar/2)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x$ are written as

$$|x_{\pm 1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{57}$$

In the Heisenberg picture, we deal with the operator $\mathsf{U}(t)^\dagger\, \mathsf{S}_x\, \mathsf{U}(t)$. It describes the evolution of the x-component of the spin. The aim is to obtain the corresponding conditional probabilities. They will show a violation of the inequalities (55) and (56) with a concrete example of spin-1/2 particle.

If the system is not altered by the environment, then its initial state $\boldsymbol{\rho}_0$ remains unchanged up to measurement. When we measure the x-component at the moment $t = \tau$, the outcome $m = \pm 1$ occurs with probability

$$p(m) = \mathrm{Tr}\bigl(\mathsf{\Pi}_m(\tau)\boldsymbol{\rho}_0\bigr) \ , \tag{58}$$

where the corresponding projector

$$\mathsf{\Pi}_m(\tau) = \mathsf{U}(\tau)^\dagger |x_m\rangle\langle x_m| \mathsf{U}(\tau) \ . \tag{59}$$

The density matrix $p(m)^{-1}\Pi_m(\tau)\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_0\,\Pi_m(\tau)$ describes the corresponding post-measurement state. For the initial state $\boldsymbol{\rho}_0 = \mathbb{1}_2/2$, we get $p(m) = 1/2$ and the post-measurement state $\Pi_m(\tau)$. Then the conditional probability of obtaining the outcome m' at the next time $t = \tau'$ is equal to

$$p(m'|m) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_{m'}(\tau')\Pi_m(\tau)\big) = \big|\langle x_{m'}|\mathsf{U}(\tau')\mathsf{U}(\tau)^\dagger|x_m\rangle\big|^2 \ . \tag{60}$$

The right-hand side of (60) is immediately connected with elements of the corresponding rotation matrix. Such matrices are well studied [57]. In the case considered, we obtain the probabilities

$$p(m'|m) = \frac{1 + m'm\cos\omega(\tau' - \tau)}{2} \ , \tag{61}$$

where $m, m' = \pm 1$. As was shown in Ref. [32], conditional probabilities of the form (61) can violate entropic inequalities of the Leggett–Garg type. In real experiments, however, quantum systems are inevitably exposed to noise. We shall theoretically study possibilities to test a violation of the macrorealistic picture in the presence of decoherence.

Suppose that the qubit is exposed to noise. For all operators of interest, we will therefore consider a transformation of the form

$$\mathsf{X} \mapsto \mathsf{U}(t)^\dagger\,\mathsf{X}\,\mathsf{U}(t) \ . \tag{62}$$

In the noisy case, the transformation (62) implies the use of the interaction picture instead of the Heisenberg one. The density matrix denoted by $\boldsymbol{\rho}_I$ now corresponds to the interaction picture and changes during the evolution. These changes are fully related to the environmental influence. Like the analysis of the previous section, we can assume that the density matrix is mapped by some quantum channel. In terms of the Bloch vector, we represent $\boldsymbol{\rho}_I$ as

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_I = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1}_2 + \vec{w}\cdot\vec{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\right). \tag{63}$$

Any qubit channel can be represented by its action on $\vec{w}$.

Another way to describe the above situation is the use of quantum master equation [58]. It is generally written in the Kossakowski–Lindblad form [59, 60]

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_S(t) = -\frac{\mathtt{i}}{\hbar}\,[\mathsf{H}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_S] + \sum_j \gamma_j\left(\mathsf{A}_j\boldsymbol{\rho}_S\mathsf{A}_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\,\mathsf{A}_j^\dagger\mathsf{A}_j\boldsymbol{\rho}_S - \frac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_S\mathsf{A}_j^\dagger\mathsf{A}_j\right). \tag{64}$$

The index "S" marks that the density matrix is related to the Schrödinger picture. The operators A_j are usually referred to as the Lindblad operators [58]. The parameters γ_j play the role of relaxation rates for different decay modes of the open system. Concrete kinds of environment influence are reflected by the corresponding Lindblad operators. When the system evolution is described by (64), the transformation (62) will imply replacing the Schrödinger picture by the interaction picture. We will consider two important models of decohering processes described by the phase damping and depolarizing channels.

Let $\delta\tau$ be the time interval between two successive measurements of the x-component of the spin. We first suppose that the Bloch vector is mapped as

$$(w_x, w_y, w_z) \longmapsto \left(\sqrt{1-\lambda}\,w_x, \sqrt{1-\lambda}\,w_y, w_z\right) , \tag{65}$$

where $\lambda(\delta\tau) = 1 - \exp(-2\gamma\,\delta\tau)$. This discrete transformation of the Bloch vector corresponds to the phase damping channel [54]. To put the transformation (65) into the form (64), we introduce the operator

$$\mathsf{N} := |1\rangle\langle 1| \ . \tag{66}$$

It shows the number of excitations, since $\mathsf{N}\,|0\rangle = 0\,|0\rangle$ and $\mathsf{N}\,|1\rangle = 1\,|1\rangle$. The qubit in dephasing environment can be described by the quantum master equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_S(t) = -\frac{\mathtt{i}}{\hbar}\,[\mathsf{H}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_S] + \gamma\big(2\mathsf{N}\boldsymbol{\rho}_S\mathsf{N} - \mathsf{N}\boldsymbol{\rho}_S - \boldsymbol{\rho}_S\mathsf{N}\big) \ . \tag{67}$$

Here, we take into account that the operator (66) is Hermitian and projective, i.e., $\mathsf{N}^2 = \mathsf{N}$. We also note that the operator (66) commutes with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z$ and is invariant under the transformation (62). For a convenience in consequent expressions, the parameter γ is rescaled as well. In the interaction picture, the corresponding density matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_I(t) = \mathsf{U}(t)^\dagger\boldsymbol{\rho}_S(t)\,\mathsf{U}(t) \tag{68}$$

is changed according to the equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_I(t) = \gamma\big(2\mathsf{N}\boldsymbol{\rho}_I\mathsf{N} - \mathsf{N}\boldsymbol{\rho}_I - \boldsymbol{\rho}_I\mathsf{N}\big)\ . \tag{69}$$

Substituting (63) to (69) finally gives $\dot{w}_x = -\gamma w_x$, $\dot{w}_y = -\gamma w_y$, and $\dot{w}_z = 0$. So, after the time t the initial horizontal components are multiplied by $\exp(-\gamma t)$; the z-component remains constant. In other words, off-diagonal elements of the density matrix (63) are exponentially decayed. By the phase damping channel, the Bloch ball is turned into an ellipsoid touching the Bloch sphere at the north and south poles [38].

We shall now recalculate the conditional probabilities (61) in the presence of dephasing environment. During the time interval from the first to the second measurements, components of the Bloch vector of any post-first-measurement state are changed as follows. First, a unitary transformation with the generator H rotates the Bloch vector around the z-axis. Second, the phase damping rescales horizontal components by the factor $\exp(-\gamma\,\delta\tau)$, where $\delta\tau = \tau' - \tau$. More precisely, in the interaction picture we write

$$p(m'|m) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\Pi_{m'}(\tau')\boldsymbol{\rho}_{Im}(\tau')\big)\ . \tag{70}$$

Here, the density matrix $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{Im}(\tau')$ is obtained from the post-first-measurement state $\Pi_m(\tau)$ according to the phase damping with the factor $\exp(-\gamma\,\delta\tau)$. It follows from (59) that

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_{Im}(\tau') = \frac{1}{2}\,\Big(\mathbb{1}_2 + \exp(-\gamma\,\delta\tau)\,m\,\mathsf{U}(\tau)^\dagger\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x\mathsf{U}(\tau)\Big)\ . \tag{71}$$

Similarly to (61), we then get the final expression

$$p(m'|m) = \frac{1 + m'm\exp(-\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos\omega\delta\tau}{2}\ . \tag{72}$$

Thus, the influence of dephasing environment merely results in exponential decay of non-trivial terms of conditional probabilities.

The completely mixed state is a fixed point for a unitary evolution as well as for the phase damping channel. Indeed, the phase damping channel is unital. The role of unitality against unitarity in the context of quantum fluctuation theorems was recently revealed [61–63]. Unital channels with controlled amount of noise were used in experimental studies of the non-local and contextual properties of biphotons [53]. Following Refs. [31, 32], we consider three measurements in equidistant time intervals. Measuring the x-component at the moment $t = \tau$, we will again have outcomes $m = \pm 1$ with the probability $p(m) = 1/2$. The latter is conditioned by the choice of the initial state. Taking $p(m)$ and $p(m'|m)$, we obtain the joint probabilities $p(m, m')$ of the outcomes m at $t = \tau$ and m' at $t = \tau'$. We also note that the expression (72) is symmetric with respect to the labels m and m'. These points allow to evaluate the corresponding distance. Instead of (49), the characteristic quantity is now expressed as

$$\mathcal{C}_q := \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X'') - \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X') - \widetilde{\Delta}_q(X', X'')\ . \tag{73}$$

In (73), the distance $\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X')$ is found from the probabilities $p(m, m')$. The distances $\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X', X'')$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_q(X, X'')$ are obtained in the same manner. Here, the conditional probabilities $p(m|m'')$ are expressed like (72), but with the interval $2\,\delta\tau$ instead of $\delta\tau$.

It is natural that an influence of the phase damping process is dependent on the ratio of its rate to the excitation frequency. To study this question, we introduce an analog of (50) written as $\kappa := \gamma/\omega$. In the notation of (67), the parameter γ is taken to be a half of the relaxation rate. Of course, the quantity (73) also depends on the entropic parameter q. It is convenient to put an auxiliary variable $\theta = \omega\delta\tau$. This substitution will allow us to exploit a similarity between the conditional probabilities (48) and (72). The characteristic quantity (73) then becomes some function $\mathcal{C}_q(\theta, \kappa)$ of two variables. In the previous section, the angle θ was a characteristic of the geometry of experiment. In this section, however, the treatment of θ is purely temporal. For the given frequency ω, values of the variable θ can be controlled by choosing $\delta\tau$.

Focusing on a behavior with respect to κ, we will again take the optimization of $\mathcal{C}_q(\theta, \kappa)$ over θ for the fixed κ and q. Formally, the function $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ is again defined by (51). The only change is that the term $\mathcal{C}_q$ is defined by (73) instead of (49). Strictly positive values of the quantity (51) will reveal a violation of the Leggett–Garg restrictions in the presence of dephasing environment. Additional ways of analysis of experimental data are provided by a possibility to vary the entropic parameter q. As was shown, the q-entropic approach can allow to reduce an amount of required detection efficiency [23, 31]. We shall now motivate that a possibility to vary q is also significant from the viewpoint of analyzing data of experiments in the presence of decoherence.



FIG. 2: The dependence $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ in the Leggett–Garg scenario with spin-1/2 system for five values of q, namely $q = 1.0; 1.2; 1.5; 2.0; 2.5$. For each value of q, only positive values of $\mathcal{S}_q$ are shown.

It is instructive to discuss the quantity $\kappa_s(q)$ introduced by (52) as well. It is important that the range $[0; \kappa_s(q)]$ essentially depends on $q \geq 1$. In Fig. 2, we have shown $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ versus κ for several values of q, including the standard case $q = 1$. With growing q, both the strength and the range of positivity are firstly increased. In effect, the curve with $q > 1$ all go over the curve for $q = 1$. With growing $q > 1$, the point $\kappa_s(q)$ also increases. For sufficiently large q, however, the strength of positivity becomes reducing. Nevertheless, the least point $\kappa_s(q)$ is still slowly increasing with growth of q. In principle, we can actually restrict a consideration to values of q around the point $q = 2.0$.

We now examine another relaxation process, which is described with the Lindblad operator $\mathsf{A}_j = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_j$ for $j = x, y, z$. One leads to the master equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_S(t) = -\frac{\mathtt{i}}{\hbar}\,[\mathsf{H}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_S] + \gamma \sum_{j=x,y,z} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_S\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j - \boldsymbol{\rho}_S)\ . \tag{74}$$

Using the unitary transformation (62), we then rewrite (74) in the interaction picture. The way is quite similar to the pass from (67) to (69). We refrain from presenting the details here. The following result takes place. Due to decoherence, the three components the Bloch vector of $\boldsymbol{\rho}_I$ are all multiplied by the factor $\exp(-4\gamma t)$. In other words, the Bloch vector is transformed as

$$(w_x, w_y, w_z) \longmapsto \big((1 - 4\mu/3)w_x, (1 - 4\mu/3)w_y, (1 - 4\mu/3)w_z\big)\ , \tag{75}$$

where $\mu(t) = (3/4)\big(1 - \exp(-4\gamma t)\big)$. The transformation (75) corresponds to the depolarizing channel with the four Kraus operators $\sqrt{1-\mu}\,\mathbb{1}$ and $\sqrt{\mu/3}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j$ for $j = x, y, z$. This channel merely shrinks the Bloch ball [38].

Instead of shrinking of horizontal components of the Bloch vector, we now deal with shrinking of the vector as a whole. As was discussed right before (72), conditional probabilities of interest are determined by changes of horizontal components of the Bloch vector. Recalculating the conditional probabilities (61), we merely replace the expression (72) by

$$p(m'|m) = \frac{1 + m'm\exp(-4\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos\omega\delta\tau}{2}\ . \tag{76}$$

The only distinction is that decaying of non-trivial terms in conditional probabilities is much faster than in (72). Thus, the above conclusions can all be applied to the case of depolarizing environment. We should only rescale the ratio κ appropriately.

Our conclusions remain valid for trichotomic observables in the Leggett–Garg scenario with noise. The spin-1 observables are represented as matrices

$$\mathsf{S}_x = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathsf{S}_y = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathtt{i} & 0 \\ \mathtt{i} & 0 & -\mathtt{i} \\ 0 & \mathtt{i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{77}$$



FIG. 3: The dependence $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ in the Leggett–Garg scenario with spin-1 system for five values of q, namely $q = 1.0; 1.2; 1.4; 1.7; 2.0$. For each value of q, only positive values of $\mathcal{S}_q$ are shown.

and $\mathsf{S}_z = \hbar\,\mathrm{diag}(+1, 0, -1)$. Each of these matrices has eigenvalues 0, $\pm\hbar$. Further, we rescale the eigenvalues as $m \in \{+1, 0, -1\}$. The noise-free evolution of the x-component is governed as $\mathsf{U}(t)^\dagger\,\mathsf{S}_x\,\mathsf{U}(t)$ with substituting the corresponding spin-1 matrices. Instead of (53), the self Hamiltonian is now represented as

$$\mathsf{H} = -\hbar\omega\,\mathrm{diag}(+1, 0, -1)\ . \tag{78}$$

The energy levels are $-\hbar\omega$, 0, $+\hbar\omega$. Dephasing processes will be described as follows. Let density matrix in the interaction picture be changed according to the master equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\boldsymbol{\rho}_I(t) = \boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\rho}_I]\ . \tag{79}$$

Generating evolution in the interaction picture, the linear superoperator is written as

$$\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\rho}_I] = \gamma\big(2\mathsf{N}\boldsymbol{\rho}_I\mathsf{N} - \mathsf{N}^2\boldsymbol{\rho}_I - \boldsymbol{\rho}_I\mathsf{N}^2\big)\,, \tag{80}$$

where $\mathsf{N} = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 0, +1)$. The latter is not changed by (62). Like the case of spin-1/2, the operator N is related to a number of excitations. It is calculated with respect to the zero energy level. However, the matrix $\mathrm{diag}(-1, 0, +1)$ is not idempotent. Except for this fact, the master equation (79) is fully similar to (69).

It is convenient to represent a density matrix in terms of generalized Bloch vector [38]. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k$'s denote the standard Gell-Mann matrices. Instead of (63), we now write

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_I = \frac{1}{3}\left(\mathbb{1}_3 + \sum\nolimits_{k=1}^{8} w_k\,\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k\right)\,, \qquad w_k = \frac{3}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_I\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k)\ . \tag{81}$$

Calculations give $\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3] = \boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_8] = \mathbf{0}$, $\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k] = -\gamma\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k$ for $k = 1, 2, 6, 7$, and $\boldsymbol{L}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k] = -4\gamma\boldsymbol{\lambda}_k$ for $k = 4, 5$. That is, the vector components w_3 and w_8 are constant, whereas other ones are exponentially decayed. So, the off-diagonal terms of a density matrix decay like either $\exp(-\gamma t)$ or $\exp(-4\gamma t)$. Such a phase decoherence takes place between the moments of observations.

If the system is initially prepared in the state $\boldsymbol{\rho}_0 = \mathbb{1}_3/3$, then the distribution $p(m)$ is uniform. The completely mixed state is a fixed point of phase damping. Conditional probabilities are calculated similarly to the above case. For all $m, m' \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$, they satisfy $p(m'|m) = p(m|m')$. This property reflects the fact that phase damping is unital. For outcomes $m, m' = \pm 1$, one gets

$$p(m'|m) = \frac{3}{8} + \frac{m'm}{2}\,\exp(-\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos\omega\delta\tau + \frac{1}{8}\,\exp(-4\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos 2\omega\delta\tau\ . \tag{82}$$

When one of the outcomes is 0, we have

$$p(\pm 1|0) = \frac{1 - \exp(-4\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos 2\omega\delta\tau}{4}\ , \tag{83}$$

$$p(0|0) = \frac{1 + \exp(-4\gamma\,\delta\tau)\cos 2\omega\delta\tau}{2}\ . \tag{84}$$

For $\gamma = 0$, the above probabilities lead to the squares of the corresponding small Wigner d-functions written with $\theta = \omega\delta\tau$. For the Leggett–Garg scenario without noise, conditional probabilities in terms of d-functions were given in Ref. [32]. In the case of equidistant time intervals, the conditional probabilities $p(m|m'')$ are expressed like (82)–(84). We should only replace $\delta\tau$ with $2\,\delta\tau$.

Keeping the corresponding probabilities, we further obtain q-entropic distances in the right-hand side of (73). Calculations show the existence of positive values of $\mathcal{C}_q$ for trichotomic observables in the Leggett–Garg scenario with noise. We again use $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ for describing an amount of violation of the metric Leggett–Garg inequality (56). Recall that the quantity $\mathcal{S}_q(\kappa)$ is formally posed by (51). This quantity is shown in Fig. 3 for several values of q. The conclusions found above for dichotomic observables are all actual for trichotomic observables. With growing q, both the strength and the range of positivity are firstly increased. Comparing Fig. 3 with Fig. 2, we only note that the range of positivity on the κ-axis is less for the spin-1 system. For $\kappa = 0$, values of $\mathcal{S}_q$ are slightly larger for $s = 1$. In units of $\ln_q(2s+1)$, however, the strength of violation decreases with growth of s [31, 32]. Thus, a violation of the q-entropic inequality (56) can be made more robust to decoherence by adopting the parameter value. We hope that the presented results could be useful in analysis of real experiments to test the Leggett–Garg inequalities.

V. CONCLUSION

We examined capabilities of conditional entropies of the Tsallis type in studying restrictions of the Bell type in the presence of decoherence. One of unifying approaches to problems of local realism and non-contextuality is provided by the so-called triangle principle. The mentioned questions are related to statistical predictions and, therefore, deal with probability distributions. Any use of the triangle principle is based on some metric in the probability space of interest. There are several realizations of the triangle principle with the use of conditional q-entropies of the Tsallis type. It turned out that both the known forms of the conditional q-entropy lead to a legitimate metric. Such metrics are naturally treated as an information-theoretic distance between random variables related to any pair of measurements. It seems that the metric based on the second conditional form was previously not considered in the literature. Using the defined metrics, we obtained the two families of information-theoretic Bell inequalities, which depends on one entropic parameter. We further considered information-theoretic inequalities of the Bell and Leggett–Garg types under decoherence. This question is studied in detail for dichotomic and trichotomic spin observables in the presence of noise environment. We considered a situation, when each of two particles in the CHSH scenario is independently subjected to the phase damping channel. As calculations showed, a violation of the corresponding q-entropic inequality become much more robust to decoherence by adopting the parameter value. Similar conclusions were made in the taken example of q-entropic restrictions of the Leggett–Garg type. A dynamics of this system is modeled by a master equation written in the Kossakowski–Lindblad form. In the interaction picture, a relaxation of the corresponding density matrix is described by the phase damping or depolarizing channels. It is natural that too fast relaxation will actually prefer tests of the Leggett–Garg inequalities in real experiments. At the same time, both the strength and range of violations can be increased by adopting suitable values of the entropic parameter. For the given ratio of relaxation rate to the excitation frequency, the violation may still be testable with certain values of q. Of course, a rate of relaxation process should be low enough. Thus, the q-entropic formulation could be useful in the analysis of recent experiments to test the contextual and non-local properties.

[1] E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaften **23** (1935) 807, 823, 844.
[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47** (1935) 777.
[3] D. Bohm, Quantum Theory, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1951.
[4] A. Shafiee, R. Maleeh, M. Golshani, Ann. Phys. **323** (2008) 432.
[5] J.S. Bell, Physics **1** (1964) 195.
[6] J.S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38** (1966) 447.
[7] S. Kochen, E.P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17** (1967) 59.
[8] A. Zeilinger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71** (1999) S288.
[9] A.J. Leggett, A. Garg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54** (1985) 857.

[10] C. Emary, N. Lambert, F. Nori, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77** (2013) 016001.
[11] A. Palacios-Laloy, F. Mallet, F. Nguyen, P. Bertet, D. Vion, D. Esteve, A.N. Korotkov, Nature Phys. **6** (2010) 442.
[12] J.-S. Xu, C.-F. Li, X.-B. Zou, G.-C. Guo, Sci. Rep. **1** (2011) 101.
[13] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, A. Zeilinger, Am. J. Phys. **58** (1990) 1131.
[14] R. Chaves, T. Fritz, Phys. Rev. A **85** (2012) 032113.
[15] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, R.A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23** (1969) 880.
[16] S.L. Braunstein, C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 662.
[17] N.J. Cerf, C. Adami, Phys. Rev. A **55** (1997) 3371.
[18] A.A. Klyachko, M.A. Can, S. Binicioğlu, A.S. Shumovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 020403.
[19] Y.-C. Liang, R.W. Spekkens, H.M. Wiseman, Phys. Rep. **506** (2011) 1.
[20] M. Araújo, M.T. Quintino, C. Budroni, M.T. Cunha, A. Cabello, Phys. Rev. A **88** (2013) 022118.
[21] G. Borges, M. Carvalho, P.-L. de Assis, J. Ferraz, M. Araújo, A. Cabello, M.T. Cunha, S. Pádua, Phys. Rev. A **89** (2014) 052106.
[22] P. Kurzyński, R. Ramanathan, D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 020404.
[23] A.E. Rastegin, Quantum Inf. Comput. **14** (2014) 0996.
[24] P. Kurzyński, D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. A **89** (2014) 012103.
[25] E. Santos, arXiv:1410.4935 [quant-ph].
[26] M. Wajs, P. Kurzyński, D. Kaszlikowski, arXiv:1410.4623 [quant-ph].
[27] R. Chaves, L. Luft, D. Gross, New J. Phys. **16** (2014) 043001.
[28] J. Henson, R. Lal, M.F. Pusey, New J. Phys. **16**, (2014) 113043.
[29] R. Chaves, C. Majenz, D. Gross, e-print arXiv:1407.3800 [quant-ph].
[30] R. Chaves, Phys. Rev. A **87** (2013) 022102.
[31] A.E. Rastegin, Commun. Theor. Phys. **62** (2014) 320.
[32] A.R. Usha Devi, H.S. Karthik, Sudha, A.K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. A **87** (2013) 052103.
[33] S. Furuichi, J. Math. Phys. **47** (2006) 023302.
[34] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52** (1988) 479.
[35] J. Havrda, F. Charvát, Kybernetika **3** (1967) 30.
[36] Z. Daróczy, Inform. Control **16** (1970) 36.
[37] A. Rényi, On Measures of Entropy and Information, in: Proceedings of 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA (1961) 547.
[38] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
[39] T.M. Cover, J.A. Thomas, Elements of Information Theory, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1991.
[40] A.E. Rastegin, Kybernetika **48** (2012) 242.
[41] Y. Horibe, Inform. Control **22** (1973) 403.
[42] C.H. Bennett, P. Gacs, M. Li, P.M.D. Vitanyi, W.H. Zurek, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **44** (1998) 1407.
[43] A.E. Rastegin, RAIRO–Theor. Inf. Appl. (2015) in press.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/ita/2014029
[44] W. Unruh, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **4** (2006) 209.
[45] D.-L. Deng, J.-L. Chen, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **7** (2009) 1313.
[46] R. Chaves, T. Fritz, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **59** (2013) 803.
[47] A. Shafiee, J. Mod. Opt. **51**, (2004) 1073.
[48] S.-B. Li, J.-B. Xu, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **6**, (2004) 373.
[49] S.-B. Li, J.-B. Xu, Phys. Rev. A **72** (2005) 022332.
[50] C.-J. Shen, W.-W. Cheng, T.-K. Liu, D.-J. Guo, Y.-J. Xia, Commun. Theor. Phys. **49** (2008) 1505.
[51] B.-Q. Liu, B. Shao, J. Zou, Phys. Lett. A **374** (2010) 1970.
[52] A.G. Kofman, Quantum Inf. Process. **11** (2012) 269.
[53] A. Shaham, H.S. Eisenberg, arXiv:1410.3640 [quant-ph].
[54] M.A. Nielsen, I.L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
[55] L. Masanes, A. Acín, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **73** (2006) 012112.
[56] D. Kaszlikowski, L.C. Kwek, J.-L. Chen, M. Żukowski, C.H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **65** (2002) 032118.
[57] L.C. Biedenharn, J.D. Louck, Angular Momentum in Quantum Physics, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1981.
[58] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, The Theory of Open Quantum Systems, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
[59] A. Kossakowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3** (1972) 247.
[60] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48** (1976) 119.
[61] T. Albash, D.A. Lidar, M. Marvian, P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. E **88** (2013) 032146.
[62] A.E. Rastegin, J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp. (2013) P06016.
[63] A.E. Rastegin, K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. E **89** (2014) 012127.